R E P O R T R E S U M E S

ED 011 095 AC 000 043

URBAN EXTENSION, A REPORT ON EXPERIMENTAL PROGRAMS ASSISTED BY THE FORD FOUNDATION.

FORD FOUNDATION, NEW YORK, N.Y.

PUB DATE OCT 66

EDRS PRICE MF-$0.09 HC-$2.08 52P.

DESCRIPTORS- *URBAN EXTENSION, *UNIVERSITY EXTENSION, *EXPERIMENTAL PROGRAMS, *COMMUNITY ACTION, COMMUNITY DEVELOPMENT, URBAN RENEWAL, RESEARCH PROJECTS, NEIGHBORHOOD IMPROVEMENT, PROGRAM DESCRIPTIONS, COMMUNITY ORGANIZATIONS, NEW YORK CITY

THIS REPORT OUTLINED THE EXPERIENCES OF EIGHT UNIVERSITIES--CALIFORNIA AT BERKELEY, DELAWARE, ILLINOIS, MISSOURI, OKLAHOMA, PURDUE, RUTGERS, AND WISCONSIN--AND A NONACADEMIC COMMUNITY DEVELOPMENT ORGANIZATION, ACTION-HOUSING, PITTSBURGH, WHICH HAD RECEIVED FORD FOUNDATION GRANTS FOR URBAN EXTENSION PROGRAMS. EACH ORGANIZATION USED THE APPROACH BEST SUITED TO ITS SIZE AND STRUCTURE, AND THE SKILLS AND TALENTS OF STAFF PERSONNEL. THE MOST SIGNIFICANT CONSEQUENCE OF MOST OF THE EXPERIMENTS LAY IN HELPING LOCAL COMMUNITIES CREATE STRUCTURES FOR THE WAR ON POVERTY, ENHANCING THE ABILITY OF UNIVERSITIES TO SERVE STATE AND LOCAL GOVERNMENTS IN SHAPING COMMUNITY ACTION PROGRAMS TO MEET FEDERAL REQUIREMENTS, CREATING A WORKING LIAISON BETWEEN THE UNIVERSITIES AND GOVERNMENT AGENCIES, AND CRYSTALLIZING SEVERAL CRITICAL QUESTIONS WHICH UNIVERSITIES MUST RESOLVE TO FUNCTION EFFECTIVELY IN URBAN AFFAIRS. THIS DOCUMENT IS ALSO AVAILABLE FROM THE FORD FOUNDATION, OFFICE OF REPORTS, 477 MADISON AVE., NEW YORK, NEW YORK 10022. (LY)

AC 000 043

ED011095

Urban Extension

A Report on Experimental Programs
Assisted by the Ford Foundation

The Ford Foundation is a private, nonprofit institution whose purpose is to serve the public welfare. It seeks to strengthen American society by identifying problems of national importance and by underwriting efforts—by institutions, talented individuals, and communities—toward their solution.

Similarly, the Foundation assists countries of Asia, Africa, the Middle East, and Latin America, at their request, with their efforts to advance the social and economic well-being of their peoples.

The Foundation was established in 1936 by Henry Ford and Edsel Ford and until 1950 made grants largely to Michigan charitable and educational institutions. Substantial increases in the Foundation's resources enabled the Foundation in 1950 to expand its program to include all of the United States and some other countries as well. Virtually all of its grants have been made since then.

Thus far, the Foundation has committed $2.9 billion to more than 5,450 colleges, universities, local school systems, community agencies, and other organizations. The recipients have been located in all fifty states, the District of Columbia, and seventy-eight foreign countries.

The Foundation does not generally engage in research, teaching, or other direct operations. It pursues its objectives as a philanthropy through grants to other nonprofit organizations. The Foundation is independent of other institutions, commercial and noncommercial. It neither controls, nor is controlled by, any business enterprise.

Urban Extension

A Report on Experimental Programs
Assisted by the Ford Foundation

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH, EDUCATION & WELFARE
OFFICE OF EDUCATION

THIS DOCUMENT HAS BEEN REPRODUCED EXACTLY AS RECEIVED FROM THE PERSON OR ORGANIZATION ORIGINATING IT. POINTS OF VIEW OR OPINIONS STATED DO NOT NECESSARILY REPRESENT OFFICIAL OFFICE OF EDUCATION POSITION OR POLICY.

"The Bible shows how the world progresses. It begins with a garden, but ends with a holy city."

—Phillips Brooks

Additional copies may be obtained by writing the Ford Foundation,
Office of Reports, 477 Madison Avenue, New York, N. Y. 10022.
Other publications are listed on page 44.

October 1966
Library of Congress Card Number 66-27861

Contents

Introduction

From Concept to Policy 2

Rural Extension 2

Urban Extension 3

The Ford Foundation Program 3

Results and Policy Questions 5

Projects 9

University of Wisconsin 9

Rutgers—The State University of New Jersey 15

University of Delaware 21

University of California (Berkeley) 24

University of Missouri 28

University of Oklahoma 30

Purdue University 33

University of Illinois 34

ACTION-Housing, Pittsburgh 35

List of Project Directors 39

Bibliography 40

From 1959 to 1966, the Ford Foundation made grants totaling $4.5 million for experiments in applying the nation's university resources directly to the problems of American cities.

Through a trinity of teaching, research, and extension work, many land-grant and state universities had contributed to vast agricultural and rural progress for at least eighty years. Could the pattern yield the same harvest in twentieth-century urban America? In a recently published book, *The City and the University*, J. Martin Klotsche, chancellor of the University of Wisconsin at Milwaukee, said:

> The University should do for the urbanized areas what the land grant colleges have done for the nation's farm population, taking the knowledge of a scholar into the community and extending the outreach of its influence to all phases of urban life.... Neither the complexity nor the controversial nature of many of our urban problems should deter universities from developing new techniques and approaches. Creative innovation, rather than the performance of routine urban services, is the special role of the university in urban extension.

Although the analogy with agricultural extension is far from perfect, the series of Foundation-assisted experiments became known as "urban extension."

Almost since it began working on a national scale in the early 1950s, the Foundation had been assisting research on urban and regional problems. The early emphasis was on physical planning and governmental structure. The Foundation also gained experience in helping efforts to improve education in inner-city schools and to prevent and control delinquency. From these interests evolved a series of Foundation-supported multi-agency attacks on city social problems, which proved to be precursors of the community-development phases of the Federal antipoverty program.

This is a report on another aspect of a long-term Foundation interest in American cities – the urban extension experiments. Although the Foundation's participation is largely completed, the idea is about to be tested on a larger scale, since it has been incorporated into Federal legislation. The Foundation hopes that the experience of the early urban extension efforts may be instructive to university faculty and administrators, public officials, and citizens engaged in Federally supported urban extension programs; they may obtain further details from the projects' directors (who are listed on page 39).

From Concept to Policy

The rapid and overwhelming changes spawned by the urbanization of the last twenty years provide the context of urban extension. They affect not only metropolitan centers but also small towns basking in rural reflections.

A vast migration of rural families to urban centers began to pose massive challenges to our administrative ingenuity and to the development of new social, economic, health, and welfare programs. The physical city—aging, neglected, and lacking in amenities—burst through its corporate boundaries. The crises of the cities, combined with the civil rights movement, turned national attention to the hidden plight of millions of families—the "disadvantaged," the "deprived," or, simply, "the poor," including those living in Appalachia and other depressed rural areas.

Among the challenging aspects of the new urbanization has been the influx of minority-group families, particularly Negroes, into urban centers, and the exodus of large numbers of white middle-class families. While the rural poor have not been ready for urban living, the city has not been ready to meet their needs. Urbanization therefore has bred racial tension as well as urban sprawl.

Rural Extension

Since 1862, the nation has incorporated into Federal law the basis of an extension system which enabled colleges and universities, together with the county-agent system, to have a profound effect upon America's rural economy—thus enriching the life of farm families.

The Morrill Act, which was signed into law by President Lincoln, provided for grants of land to the states for the purpose of establishing higher education opportunities for the "industrial classes" by teaching agriculture, mechanic arts, and military tactics. By 1887, agricultural experiment stations were being underwritten by the government in each of the land-grant colleges. Soon farmers' institutes were formed and off-campus extension programs became quite popular.

Shortly after the turn of the century, demonstration projects were instituted to solve specific problems of the farmer. In 1906, the first county agent was hired. In 1914, Congress enacted the Smith-Lever Law, which established the Cooperative Extension

Service in Agriculture and Home Economics. It provided financial support for the services that had been offered throughout the country by the land-grant universities, the Department of Agriculture, and the county agents.

Today, sixty-two land-grant colleges enroll some 750,000 full-time students. Hundreds of thousands of others, who are not formally involved in training programs, are being aided by the extensive university programs in the community. Typically, the Cooperative Extension Service has a county agent assigned to a local field office. He is aided by a home-economics agent and a 4-H agent who works with younger people. Supporting the county agent are campus specialists and a variety of materials and bulletins prepared by the college and the Department of Agriculture. Thus the entire family unit in the rural setting is afforded the resources of the land-grant college.

Urban Extension

In 1862, when the land-grant colleges were established, about 85 per cent of the nation's population lived in rural communities. Today, nearly the same proportion lives in urban areas.

Can the research and teaching resources of universities be tapped to better understand and control our urban environment? Can we train specialists such as "urban agents" to deal with the complex problems of America's cities? The challenges are particularly pointed to state universities that have a mandate to serve the community. If "community," once predominantly rural, has changed in location, ethnic composition, economic activity, and needs for services, a university must accommodate accordingly if it wishes to remain a relevant and progressive force.

The Ford Foundation Program

In starting its experiments, the Ford Foundation anticipated the possibility that urban extension programs might ultimately attract large-scale state and Federal support.

Since the first Foundation grant in this field was made to Rutgers University, the state university of New Jersey, in June, 1959, a total of eight universities have received assistance. In addition, grants were made to test the extension concept in two non-academic institutions–ACTION-Housing, in Pittsburgh, whose

program is described later, and the National 4-H Club Foundation.*

Besides Rutgers, the university recipients of Foundation grants were California (Berkeley), Delaware, Illinois, Missouri, Oklahoma, Purdue, and Wisconsin.

The experimental programs they undertook do not lend themselves easily to judgments of success or failure. Rather, they can be viewed as investments that have yielded ideas, techniques, and insights that universities may profitably examine as they venture more deeply into urban problems.

With the passage of the Higher Education Act of 1965, three years after the centennial of the Land Grant College law, Congress enacted new legislation authorizing community service and continuing education extension programs in colleges throughout the nation. Title I of the law provides up to $25 million in 1966, of which $10 million has been appropriated; thus, more than twice as much government money is available in one year than the Foundation spent on urban extension in six years. Moreover, the law provides $50 million in each of the succeeding two years, and "such sums as Congress may deem appropriate" for 1969 and 1970.

The law defines the term "community service program" as:

> "...an educational program, activity, or service, including a research program and a university extension or continuing education offering, which is designed to assist in the solution of community problems in rural, urban or suburban areas, with particular emphasis on urban and suburban problems, where the institution offering such program, activity, or service determines—
>
> (1) that the proposed program, activity, or service is not otherwise available, and
>
> (2) that the conduct of the program or performance of the activity or service is consistent with the institution's over-all educational program and is of such a nature as is appropriate to the effective utilization of the institution's special resources and the competences of the faculty.

Where course offerings are involved, such courses must be univer-

*The grant to the 4-H club movement was confined to a study of its operations. The study concluded that it was unlikely that the 4-H clubs could soon become a major force in the cities. 4-H still represents, to most people, a rural teaching and service organization, the study found. It led to the creation of an *ad hoc* committee to evaluate 4-H programs in cities, to plan for the development of local urban leadership, and address other staff and financial problems in reorienting the 4-H clubs to the urban setting. The report, titled *4-H in Urban Areas*, is available in condensed form from the National 4-H Club Foundation, 7100 Connecticut Avenue, Chevy Chase, Maryland.

sity extension or continuing education courses and must be–

(A) fully acceptable toward an academic degree, or

(B) of college level as determined by the institution offering such courses."

While the Foundation's grants were confined to land-grant and state universities, under the Federal law any institution of higher education is eligible.* The appropriations are contingent upon the designation of an appropriate agency in the state to draw up a plan for the use of the funds which, in turn, must be approved by the Federal Commissioner of Education.

Thus, urban extension has been transformed from an experimental concept to national policy.

Results and Policy Questions

The concepts of urban extension have not yielded to comfortable definitions or simple formulas. The nature of a given urban area, the structure of the university, the disciplines of its staff, the philosophy of its president – each colored the outcome of the experiment. No one approach or proven technique has emerged as superior to all others.

While ostensibly patterned after the traditional agricultural extension operation, the urban umbrella proved much too large for restriction to any single approach. Indeed, a semantic jungle surrounds the term "urban"–the sociological and economic implications of the word "rural" have been relatively clear, but somehow "urban" has come to mean "all that is not rural."

For the purposes of the urban extension program, "urban problems" fall into two main clusters.

The first centers about low-income families, particularly Negroes and recent in-migrants of various groups–their individual lacks (education, income, job motivation, health, and housing) and community problems arising from low-income concentrations, such as ghettoes, blighted neighborhoods, and racial conflicts. Thus, whereas the agricultural agent could address himself specifically to helping the farmer increase his productivity, his urban counterpart faces the fact that the "product" of his client is, simply put, survival in the city.

---

*The funds are in the form of grants to states and are administered by the Division of Adult Education Programs in the Bureau of Adult and Vocational Education, U.S. Office of Education.

The second constellation of urban problems, most often preoccupying smaller cities and suburbs that have no significant racial changes or housing shortages, arise from defects in the physical environment—water and air pollution, traffic congestion, shortage of parking, and lack of open space.

The universities that received urban extension grants from the Foundation chose approaches that best suited their urban climate and their own size and structure. The particular skills and talents of staff personnel also were influential in shaping the programs.

One example of the different courses of action is demonstrated in the concept of "urban agent." At the University of Oklahoma, the urban agent was transformed into an "urban scientist." At the University of Illinois the "urban generalist" emerged as a highly skilled staff specialist—presumably a Ph.D.—who called upon other specialists to aid in specific urban problems. At the University of Missouri and Purdue University, the home economist, long a stand-by as part of rural cooperative extension, came to the fore as an urban agent after making the necessary adjustments to deal with the family problems of the city dweller.

At the University of Delaware, the "urban agent" served as a roving adviser to local governmental officials. At Rutgers, urban affairs specialists filled a similar role on a statewide basis. At the University of Wisconsin, the urban agent idea was discarded in favor of "urban teams." In Pittsburgh, action-oriented "urban extension agents" from a nonacademic organization had difficulty tying in their operations with local universities.

The universities in these experiments have found as many significant differences as parallels between agricultural extension and urban extension. Unlike rural areas in earlier decades, the contemporary city already provides urban families with a wide range of individual and collective services. Suitable points at which the urban agent may usefully enter are elusive.

While agricultural extension also had difficulties reaching its "clients," the ills of the farm sector tend to be economic and technological. A land-grant school could help a farmer by research that improved the quality of his fertilizer or the milk production of his cows; the extra yield could even be measured, priced, and reduced to input-output relations. Urban research, on the other hand, tends to be conceptual, explanatory, and exhortatory. There

are no direct benefits to Negro families, groping mayors, and harassed health and welfare councils from even a first-rate research monograph on the history of building permits or the prevision of the future metropolis. Agricultural extension was a useful device for helping further the education of men and women who lived in areas too remote or thinly settled for adequate facilities. But the stubborn educational problems of the city are usually due not to a lack of nearby schools but to a lack of motivation, cultural barriers, defects in the school, or all of these. The student of urbanism can describe, classify, or theorize about such shortcomings, but ideas for direct solution come hard and slowly.

The most significant consequence of most of the experiments was that they helped local communities create a structured means by which to participate in the national war on poverty. Neighborhoods in which extension programs operated were better equipped to organize for the antipoverty programs than other areas in the same cities. Similarly, the engagement of the universities enhanced their ability to serve state and local governments in setting up community action programs to meet Federal requirements. Federal poverty programs, more than any other factor, gave shape and purpose to the urban extension programs. They provided a timely crucible in which new ideas and programs were formed.

Another important by-product of urban extension programs was the working liaison that was established between the universities and governmental agencies. In some instances the universities were drawn into a continuing role of helping local and state governments develop and implement urban programs. Often the university was looked upon as a neutral forum where ideas could be exchanged and programs instituted outside a partisan political framework.

Finally, the experiments crystallized a set of critical questions that universities must resolve if they are to deal effectively with the problems of an urban society:

– Are universities presently structured to assume urban commitments? There appears to be a growing realization that responsiveness to the urban environment calls for an across-the-board commitment. An isolated department or division devoted to urban affairs appears to have limited impact upon the university as a whole.

– Are there limits to the university engagement in community conflict? In some urban-extension experiments, university-trained personnel have engaged in disputes with city officials and other local powers.

– To what extent are universities inhibited from possible involvement in local politics? In one case, a proposed police-training course was abandoned because of fear of such involvement.

– Can universities that undertake extension operations use the same system of academic rewards for staff as they use in so-called line departments? The traditional rewards of promotion and academic recognition are still based upon scholarship, research, and professional association, rather than upon the service functions performed by the new breed of academicians whose extracurricular labor is extension work in the field.

– Can the proper incentives be provided to attract the talent and skills needed to do the extension job in the cities? The great demand for professional assistance in urban matters places new emphasis upon the university training programs as well as upon the use of specialists.

– Are the differences between agricultural (cooperative) extension, general extension, and academic departments more sharply drawn by university traditions and administrative structure than conditions actually warrant? The cooperative extension service, aided by years of Federal and state subsidy, has often created a semiautonomous division within the university structure. General extension, which includes adult-education and other non-credit programs, is often looked upon as a step-sister in the university system. The academic departments, many of which insulate themselves from community involvement, are sometimes responsible for forcing extension services to develop independent or duplicative structures.

Some institutions are already confronting these issues. In Missouri and Wisconsin, for example, the state universities have combined most extension activities under one command. The University of Delaware has coordinated all off-campus programs under a vice president and appears to be committed to a reward system based on a different set of standards for urban affairs involvement.

If the concept of urban extension has not crystallized into a

neat body of uniformly accepted practices, it is worth recalling that it took the American university thirty-five years to move from the Land-Grant Act to a rural extension system, and another twenty-five years for that system to succeed fully. Considering the fact that urban extension is some seven years old and that it deals with a substantially more complex set of elements than rural extension, the beginning is more impressive than the shortcomings and unresolved questions here noted may indicate.

This report outlines some of the experiences of eight universities and a nonacademic community development organization under Ford Foundation urban extension grants.

Projects

UNIVERSITY OF WISCONSIN

The "Wisconsin Idea" stands in national academic circles as a trademark for a strong university tradition of aid to the statewide community. The "Wisconsin Idea" was already being applied to urban areas when the university received a five-year $1 million Ford Foundation grant for urban extension in 1960 (supplemented by a further $250,000 in 1964). The university's Madison campus had an urban and regional planning program, and its Milwaukee center (the most rapidly growing arm of the university) was holding extension courses for management and government officials.

The grant was administered by an executive committee, which adopted a policy of spreading the funds as widely as possible throughout the state university system, to nearly every facet of teaching, research, and extension activity. An "urban work group" was formed to do the detailed administrative work and planning with the aid of subcommittees in Madison and in Milwaukee.

This administrative web reached the university's sprawling outlets throughout the state. Because of the size and complex structure of the institution, results were not soon apparent. However, by the end of the first two years, there were significant changes taking place throughout the university system under the impetus of the grant-assisted program.

Among the main changes were the establishment of a Department of Urban Affairs at the Milwaukee campus, which offers a rich curriculum leading to a master's degree; the development of

fellowships and scholarships to attract students of urban affairs; the establishment of a Department of Urban and Regional Planning at Madison with a highly qualified faculty; and the general strengthening of faculty concerned with urban problems.

Extension Evolution

In spite of its agricultural traditions and a well-established general extension division that reached throughout the state, the university looked upon the "urban agent" as an anachronism in dealing with the diverse and complex problems of the city. Rather, the university sought to set up multidisciplinary research-action teams for dealing with matters on regional bases.

The extension activities of the university were divided into three major areas. One was Milwaukee, which has 25 per cent of the total population of Wisconsin. Another program was launched in the Fox Valley, a rapidly urbanizing industrial strip between Green Bay and Oshkosh, where the two-year Fox Valley university center is located.

The third area selected was Columbia County, a small town-rural region which is characteristic of the state outside of the larger metropolitan centers; it contains the famed vacation section known as the Wisconsin Dells. In Columbia County, the university sought to integrate the work of its cooperative extension and general extension divisions. This approach was significant since the university later reorganized its entire extension operation to include both the cooperative and general extension arms in one unified division. The objective, according to Fred Harrington, president of the university, is eventually to eliminate the "urban-rural" delineation.

Milwaukee—The University of Wisconsin at Milwaukee is only ten years old, and already has had a major influence on national thinking about the role of the city-based university.

The university branch used its share of Ford Foundation funds to develop "urban teams"—faculty members from several disciplines who went into action on specific local targets.

The team approach draws heavily upon the new Department of Urban Affairs at Milwaukee, whose staff of specialists has become immersed in the problems of the city's inner core. The interaction of faculty and their graduate students with local leaders has stimu-

lated community interest toward social action goals and self-help programs.

One of the important areas for action research was the older central area of Milwaukee, which has a large concentration of low-income Negro families. Studies here included analyses of the decision-making process, the motivation and capacity of Negroes to move out of segregated areas, the political awareness of Negroes, and youth employment.

Several community-based programs have been launched under the university's urban extension operations. One, supervised by Belden Paulson, seeks to help middle-class Negroes organize to help poorer residents of the city's inner core. Special programs have been developed for school dropouts, poor readers, and the organization of block workers.

Another series of projects focused upon social action programs in low-income areas. Warner Bloomberg, Jr., a sociologist, directed workshop sessions with a local self-help neighborhood association. Over five months, members of the group learned how to process complaints through governmental departments, read state and municipal law, prepare public statements, conduct meetings, and keep records. The participants applied what they learned by taking leading roles in school board elections, the local poverty program, and other official activities affecting their community.

> "Three graduate students in the Department of Urban Affairs who assisted me in the workshop stayed with the group in its Saturday meetings and action projects after I withdrew," Bloomberg observes. "Several months later they began phasing out their involvement. The group knows it can call on us at the university for further education and consultation on action if and when it decides this is needed. Only time will tell if the group will persist and flourish, or, like most such small organizations in 'poverty' areas, slowly wane and eventually disappear. Meanwhile, we have started a second experimental group, this time with over thirty representatives of eleven neighborhood and social action groups in the Inner Core North. But our format is a little different because of differences in need, situation, and resources of the participants. This reflects our conviction that there is no one 'right way' with respect to the details of technique. In this whole exploration, we have barely begun to map the terrain."

Another aspect of the university's extension program is what Kirk Petshek, the urban extension coordinator, termed "dialogues within community groups." These usually involve homogeneous groups who are made aware of their own values and goals through

a series of seminars. These included a seminar on "The Church and Urban Change," in which clergymen from several major denominations discussed critical community problems. Other projects were seminars on Milwaukee's downtown area problems and institutes for labor leaders.

Despite growing success in dealing with the community, university officials are careful to draw the line where the university activities should end. "Universities should not be writing dog-leash ordinances," Petshek declared, "nor should we be committed to a continuing involvement with one group."

J. Martin Klotsche, chancellor of the University at Milwaukee, had a similar observation: "A university can get its nose bloodied in the community, and I'm not too concerned about that. But there is danger in offering to solve problems for the community. We must remain a basic resource and not perform routine urban services."

Fox Valley Demonstration—The team in charge of the extension effort in the Fox Valley area consisted of a political scientist, a sociologist, and a labor educator. Other specialists, including an economist and an engineer, moved in and out of the team.

The staff specialists assigned to the two-year college center at Menasha carried out service-research activities, including studies of the people, the economy, local government, and geographic features of the valley. The local team generally had autonomy in selecting research projects and in programming extension services.

Despite some valuable projects and studies, the university did not consider the Fox Valley demonstration a success.

L. H. Adolfson, dean of university extension, explained: "We recognized that a small, 900-student center cannot sustain a separate, autonomous team of experts apart from the main faculty with all the resources that the university has to offer.

"We clearly need persons in each discipline who have a marked scholarly orientation. Such an orientation is needed to relate the academic community of the university to the communities in the valley.... The faculty of the university center was dedicated almost solely to freshman and sophomore classroom instruction. They were not oriented to the broader interests of the university, nor indeed to community service. Our experience at Fox Valley convinces us that we need persons who have a combination of interests

if the urban program is to achieve the kind of goals we have set. ...This is an intricate staffing problem."

Adolfson believes that the difficulty of recruiting the necessary skills on a specialized basis for a small, satellite unit would pose similar problems in the other two-year centers that are being developed throughout the state.

Columbia County—Seeking ways of integrating the work of the Cooperative Extension Service and the University Extension Division, the university's effort in rural Columbia County led to the addition of a resource development agent and a resource home economist to the county agricultural extension staff.

The addition of a resource development agent was an apparent success and established a precedent which is being repeated throughout the state.

The Columbia County program dealt with a wide range of development problems—business, recreational, industrial, and government and public affairs. Consultants, including a business specialist, conducted studies and analyzed local needs.

The Columbia County project pointed up some of the problems that will have to be worked out if the cooperative extension and general extension divisions are to be unified, the university believes. For example, it was felt that there was a need for general orientation to acquaint the staffs of each division with the resources available in the other. And tangled jurisdictions and conflicting methods of operation (for example, some services are provided free while others entail fees) will have to be resolved.

Training Urban Specialists

Objectives of the university's teaching program under the Foundation-assisted effort were:

—To strengthen the entire faculty in urban matters;

—To enrich the curriculum of the regular university departments as well as university extension;

—To develop fellowships and scholarships to attract new talent;

—To train urban specialists at both graduate and undergraduate levels;

—To undergird a research program for graduate interns.

The establishment in 1963 of a graduate Department of Urban Affairs in the College of Letters and Science at the university's

Milwaukee branch is regarded at the university as one of the first important elements in developing a uniquely urban university. The department emphasizes preparation of urban professionals in several specialties to be employed by civic groups, public agencies, and other institutions requiring a broad understanding of urban problems.

Graduates are expected to serve not as routine technicians, but eventually in broader problem-solving, policy-proposing capacities. Most urban jobs, particularly in public employment, require specific skills and education. Consequently the students are encouraged to go beyond a core program in urban history, sociology, and political science and specialize in such fields as urban planning or urban redevelopment. Since many courses pertinent to such fields lay outside the Department of Urban Affairs (e.g., architecture, engineering, public administration) it was considered essential to the success of the teaching program that other departments build into their courses appropriate series of lectures and readings on urbanism.

The department has already attracted national interest and most of the fellows and graduate students have been recruited from outside the state. Henry J. Schmandt, director of the department, reports that graduates are going on to responsible positions in government, with job skills adaptable to such new programs as those of the Office of Economic Opportunity and the Department of Housing and Urban Development.

The graduate students are required to participate with faculty members in urban research and other field projects. Thus, special dispensation has been given to several priests and nuns enrolled in the department to wear civilian clothing so that they may work unobtrusively in the community. The department curriculum ranges from theoretical aspects of urban development to the particulars of government financing, housing and planning, land economics, transportation, and minority group problems.

At Madison the university used grant funds to transform a series of courses into a bona fide graduate Department of Urban and Regional Planning. The university has attracted urban specialists, and by increasing the number of fellowships and assistantships, the grant enables the university to recruit more outstanding graduate students nationally.

Research

Soon after the urban extension effort began, the university staff was producing upwards of sixty major research papers, books, professional articles, and other studies a year. Early research activities were geared largely to the specialized interests of staff members, but as time went on, there was a shift toward applied-research studies.

The range of research projects extended from theoretical studies ("Visions of Metropolis: Theories of City Growth in the West") to such specific surveys as a soil inventory in Fox Valley.

Most research now supports or provides generalized background for the community activities of the university.

RUTGERS, THE STATE UNIVERSITY OF NEW JERSEY

Rutgers, like the University of Wisconsin, is a land-grant university with a deep-seated conviction about its role in serving urban communities. President Mason Gross has sought to involve the university in the growing problems of New Jersey, which is the nation's most urbanized state, and, according to John E. Bebout, could well be considered "the *city* of New Jersey." Bebout is director of the Urban Studies Center that Rutgers established after it received an urban extension grant from the Ford Foundation in 1959.

Unlike Wisconsin, Rutgers has focused its urban extension grant funds (totaling $1,250,000) in an Urban Studies Center, rather than spread throughout the university system. The center, however, feeds back into the total university operation and is now closely linked to a new Bureau of Community Services of the general extension division. The Bureau serves as a clearinghouse for community and government requests for university help.

The center's interdisciplinary staff numbers ten full-time specialists or teachers, many of whom are appointed jointly by an academic department. In addition, several research assistants and a number of volunteer urban agents aid the senior staff members. The Urban Studies Center itself has no formal graduate teaching program, a fact that some within the university view as a deficiency.

The center has become the command post for a considerable range of high-level research on complex urban problems, as well

as a service center for assisting state and local governments in developing antipoverty and other new programs.

Rutgers set three basic interrelated goals for itself in urban extension:

—to help the university relate effectively to a constantly changing urban society;

—to help the state and its component communities to develop a greater capacity for dealing with urban problems and guiding urban development;

—to contribute generally to the development of knowledge of urban society and the processes of change, and to methods of applying this knowledge.

The University and its Community

The Rutgers Urban Studies Center has sought to assemble an interdisciplinary staff to include specialists in political science, sociology, demography, public administration, planning, community organization, adult education, library service, geography, and business administration. The strong emphasis of the staff, however, is on sociology.

Among the important community work the center has undertaken, the most significant was the "South Side Project" in an area of low-income Negroes in Newark. The center combined the talents of its own staff, the university's other resources, the energies of Newark's institutional decision-makers and poor residents of the area, to focus upon local problems. The resulting communication and cooperative programs served as a prototype for future projects growing out of the "war on poverty." This experiment placed the Rutgers Urban Studies Center in the forefront of the state's planning for antipoverty projects that were being financed by Washington.

The South Side Project was an outgrowth of a series of seminars which had been conducted jointly with the Brookings Institution of Washington on the human aspects of urban renewal. The relations that faculty and community leaders in Newark developed in the seminars proved invaluable in the evolution of more intensive and long-lasting programs.

The center also conducts bi-weekly seminars and work sessions for volunteer urban agents—a select group of citizens active in

the community. Most of them are women, because the center insists that volunteer agents be available during the day to carry out community assignments. The group represents a cross-section of income and ethnic lines, although middle-class women predominate. The program that brought these women together with their counterparts from all over the state has enabled them to share information and gain important insights into how to be more effective citizen volunteers. Participants are provided with scholarships for the seminar series through the Urban Studies Center.

Focus on Learning

Although the Urban Studies Center does not have a formal teaching function, it serves as a resource for new ideas and approaches to learning. Its seminars have brought members of the faculty and other professionals in touch with the center's project planning. Increasingly, staff members of the center serve as consultants to faculty and students, especially graduate students, on special projects. They have also given lectures in both academic and nonacademic programs conducted in other divisions of the university and teach urban-oriented courses in their regular departments. The center library has developed into an important research tool for students, faculty, and the public.

Illustrative of the center's work with other divisions is its experience with the geography department, which was interested in developing its capacity in the urban field. The center and the department engaged an urban geographer on a joint appointment. Because of this cooperative development in urban geography, he was selected to prepare a new urban unit of the high-school geography project sponsored by the Association of American Geographers and supported by the National Science Foundation. The center also helped develop the urban component of the university's department of sociology, which has grown into one of the strong urban-oriented sociology programs in the East.

The center conducted a three-year experiment in extension education to test whether the approaches used in the Harvard-Nieman Fellowship Program for journalists could be adapted to various kinds of urban specialists. The center recruited as fellows a group of mid-career teachers, city officials, journalists, labor officials, clergymen, and others whose professions centered on urban prob-

lems. Unlike the homogeneous Nieman program, the variety itself posed difficulties. Some of the fellows had little or no formal academic background, while others were highly trained in a specialized field.

The center set up seminars and other courses for the fellows. They conducted specific projects in their areas of interest, and prepared papers at the termination of their one-year stay. Lack of full-time center staff and the heavy loads carried by staff in other departments made it difficult to plan programs adequately for the fellows.

Center officials cite two reasons why, "while conceptually fruitful, the program fell short of its mark." First, the full resources of the university's departments could not be made available to the group of fellows—rather, the center had to prepare and implement a substantially new urban program to meet their needs. Second, employers generally were unwilling or unable to give extended leave to key people to participate.

"The fear expressed by employers that if the program was effective, they would lose their people to other jobs proved valid," the center reported. "Most of the fellows moved on to better or 'more exciting' jobs (in planning, housing, community action, etc.) in the urban field."

Relation to Government

Government officials, principally on the state level, have frequently called on the center for advice and objective assistance. The center has worked with such agencies as the New Jersey Department of Public Health (on research in public health programs in low-income areas), the Division of State and Regional Planning (on the development of the state's meadowlands, urban transportation, and other planning studies), and the Division of Aging (in analysis of the state's older population). For three years the center also conducted monthly seminars with the university's Bureau of Government Research for administrators of the state's six largest cities.

The closest relationship is with the New Jersey Office of Economic Opportunity and with local governments, helping them to participate under the Economic Opportunity Act. The center has maintained a key position in providing the technical assistance to

develop antipoverty programs and in setting up local implementation machinery, particularly nonprofit corporations.

The success of the center in its governmental liaison work was noted by Frank P. Zeidler, former mayor of Milwaukee, who served on a Foundation evaluation committee for the urban extension program. He wrote: "The feeling expressed was one of mutual helpfulness between the state agencies and the center. State agency officials...seemed to find in the center an agency which could help them implement their programs, and discharge their duties, find contacts for them in local governments, or serve as a foil for testing ideas and getting counsel without loss of face for the agency head."

Research

The research program of the center has concentrated on sociological, educational, and demographic phenomena. As is the case in other self-appraisals of program, it became difficult for the university to delineate easily between what is termed "action" (or "applied research") and "theoretical research." The Rutgers center categorizes its major research projects in three levels:

—that which was needed to provide information to assist in the center's long-range policy formulations;

—that which was needed to complement the center's education and extension activities;

—that which was the product of the special interest or expertise of the center's staff specialists.

The research ranges over such subjects as New Jersey's urban history, social and cultural factors related to achievement in slum schools, local government policies, blighted urban real estate, and municipal politics in Newark.

The Extension Program

As outlined by the center director, the seven goals of Rutgers' urban extension program are:

1. *Clearinghouse.* This is primarily a communications role both within the university and between the university and community. The center's library and its information resources exemplify this function.

2. *Counselor and Consultant.* This function takes such forms as preparing information and materials for governmental agencies,

advising local community groups and civic and welfare agencies, and serving as an intellectual resource within the university family.

3. *Convener.* Seeking to develop public consideration of key urban problems, the center has convened meetings and conferences on such subjects as new towns, transportation, planning in the meadowlands, conservation and land-use control, data collection and processing, urban renewal, and education for disadvantaged groups. The center also serves as the secretariat for monthly meetings and provides research and related staff services for the Six City Committee of Business Administrators, which consists of the chief administrative aides of the state's largest cities.

4. *Policy Seminars and Conferences.* Examples of seminars the center has sponsored to assist in decision-making on major urban policy issues include the studies co-sponsored by the Brookings Institution with Newark leaders and university faculty members, and sessions on transportation, environmental health, and urban renewal.

5. *Special Education.* The center assists in urban studies seminars, courses in data processing, urban church seminars, and fellowship programs.

6. *General Education and Public Information.* This includes lecture series and publication and dissemination programs geared to the general community.

7. *Demonstration Projects.* Special projects the center has helped develop include the Rutgers Educational Assistance Program, which is designed to increase the opportunities of educationally disadvantaged children. Conducted by the Grauate School of Education, the program involves faculty, students, and university specialists in teaching, counseling, and training.

UNIVERSITY OF DELAWARE

The University of Delaware provided the best proving ground for one variant of the urban extension concept—service to urban government. It too was steeped in the tradition of cooperative extension and in serving communities throughout the small but prosperous state. The university itself was not so large as to suffer internal bureaucratic problems in structuring an urban affairs program. These factors, coupled with the strong determination

of President John A. Perkins to focus the energies of the university upon the emerging urban patterns in the state, provided a sound basis for the urban extension experiment.

Since April 1961, the University of Delaware has received $775,000 in Ford Foundation grants to carry out programs developed under a new Division of Urban Affairs. Directed by Edward S. Overman, it was established as a separate unit of the university and placed under the general supervision of the vice president for university relations.

Although residents of the nation's large metropolitan areas may be puzzled at the thought of urban problems in tiny Delaware, Perkins notes that because of its strategic location along the New York-Washington axis, it is, proportionately, one of the most thoroughly urbanizing states and may become "the first to be completely paved, in a manner of speaking."

Perkins is candid in explaining the decision to create a separate division within the university to apply the urban extension funds. "The secret of our success," he says, "is that we didn't give the money to the professors. We hired people for specific missions. And we measured them by their urban affairs activities, and not by the number of articles published in journals." The staff represented disciplines with competence and interest in urban affairs, including political science, public administration, sociology, economics, and planning. Senior staff were given appointments jointly in the division and in colleges and departments of the university.

The result of this approach, the university believes, is an urban affairs division which devotes most of its technical efforts to applied research on a statewide and local basis, deals with the "nuts and bolts" operating problems of the small communities as well as the state, and seeks to infuse both its own graduate students and the undergraduate curriculum with a new understanding of urban phenomena.

A Resource to Government

The Division of Urban Affairs plunged into a wide program of service research on behalf of state, municipal, and county planning agencies. It conducted several economic and population studies, including the development of a statewide data and census system that provides a running inventory of demographic data used

in school planning, redistricting, programs involving transportation, and improvement of the tax base. An economic base study was carried out for the greater Wilmington Development Council, a private business group working for community improvement.

Special studies were made for the governor on new revenue sources. Staff work for a governor's committee led to a reorganization of the government of New Castle County. A home-rule charter was prepared for another county. A statewide economic-population study series was prepared under contract to the State Planning Office as background for a State Comprehensive Plan. The division developed a land classification code, helped design a transportation planning program, and conducted studies of school dropouts. Comprehensive plans were developed for the cities of Newark and New Castle.

The division played a leading role in the formation of the Delaware League of Local Governments, a vehicle through which local officials exchange views on techniques of managing local problems. The division established special programs in police training and police relations with the public. It also extended in-service programs for officials dealing with juvenile delinquency, the courts, and corrections. More recently the division has been working closely with the state on Office of Economic Opportunity programs and a study toward reorganization of the state government.

The Teaching Function

Despite its relative independence within the university's framework, the Division of Urban Affairs has a commitment to the training of students. The division administers a graduate fellowship program in urban affairs which attracts students in the social sciences and education. The program leads to a master's degree in the College of Business and Economics, Department of Political Science, Department of Sociology, or the College of Education.

The division staff offers a graduate seminar in urban affairs for both urban affairs fellows and other interested graduate students. As part of their training, the students participate in some of the large-scale research projects. During the regular school year the urban affairs fellows work fifteen hours a week as assistants to the staff members of the division. A summer internship in state or local government offices is arranged for some students, and

others may work full time in the division. The internships in most instances provide the basis for master's theses.

The graduate students represent a variety of disciplines and are drawn from out of state as well as from Delaware. Although most of them came from rural or suburban areas, they express a sense of frustration about the undergraduate apathy toward urban problems. Sharing this concern, the Division of Urban Affairs developed an "Undergraduate Program for Understanding Our Urban Society." The program sponsors bus tours of New York and other urban centers in which urban specialists guide the students. Prominent speakers have visited the campus to discuss urban problems.

Another recent innovation is a pre-college opportunity program conducted by the Division of Urban Affairs and the College of Education. It is designed to help promising disadvantaged students complete high school and enter a college or university. It is specifically geared to the Negro youngsters who have experienced cultural and economic disadvantages that depress their academic performance and may preclude their going on to higher education. While the program is educationally oriented, it requires the skills of persons familiar with the urban environment to instill confidence in the program within Negro communities and to elicit the cooperative spirit necessary to motivate these young people to college training. The director of the Pre-College Opportunity Program, J. King Chandler, is a full-time member of the staff of the Division of Urban Affairs who holds a joint appointment as assistant professor in the College of Education.

The Urban Agent

A unique product of the Division of Urban Affairs was the development of a highly skilled urban agent. He serves as a major resource to communities, stimulating local interest in new projects. He is a specialist in municipal management and in unsnarling red tape at both the state and Federal level.

This task fell to John V. Johnson, former assistant to the city manager of Alexandria, Virginia, who has sought to inject new ideas and new hope into small, economically stagnant communities throughout Delaware. Many of the towns in Delaware have been declining for the past thirty or forty years, he explains.

" 'We'll either sit here and die or do something,' was the way one part-time mayor of a town of 600 people put it," says Johnson.

The town in question, Millsboro, once a thriving center for fishing and peat bog products, had lost almost a thousand jobs in fifteen years. After assisting in a review of the community's problems, the university's Urban Affairs Division recommended that the water system be revamped, new sewers installed, and new land be annexed to triple the area of the community and double its population. These steps were to expand the tax base so that the town could finance the improvements. Since the completion of the study, new industry was brought into the community, providing some 600 jobs. Here, as in a number of communities throughout the state, the university provided the technical assistance in such matters as city planning and management.

Among other activities of the urban agent was the establishment of a police institute to train local law enforcement officers in communities too small to support such a program independently.

UNIVERSITY OF CALIFORNIA (BERKELEY)

In late 1961, Oakland, California became the first American community in which the Ford Foundation funded a program that became a precursor of Federal community-action efforts in the war on poverty. The so-called "gray area" program sought to attack not just the symptoms, but the roots of deprivation in jobs, education, housing, and recreation. The means was chiefly the coordination of programs of both public and private agencies.

In the following year, a $99,500 grant was made to the University of California (Berkeley) for an urban extension program to tie in with the Oakland gray area project (a further $98,500 was granted in 1966).

The University-Oakland Project was designed to speed up the application of university research and services to actual community problems through extension activities tailored to local needs.

The Oakland extension effort is guided by a faculty advisory committee appointed by the chancellor of the university. It draws advisers from the departments of city and regional planning, criminology, political science, education, sociology, social welfare, public health, and industrial relations.

The grant financed the employment of a full-time liaison officer,

a full-time secretary, five work-study students, and the allocation of one-third of the time of an extension department head to supervise the project.

Extension Programs

The University-Oakland Project sought to form a three-way link among official agencies, grass-roots organizations, and the university. The Foundation-financed antipoverty project, which was working in a racially mixed, lower middle-class neighborhood, was to use the university project as "a conduit... to tap the resources of the university."

Although the early efforts of the marriage produced several interdepartmental workshops and some training programs for government agencies in Oakland, relations between the two projects soon became strained.

According to one university official "the University-Oakland Project's efforts to develop close liaison with [the poverty project] were hampered by [the latter's] position in the city government. The community action efforts of both were impeded by fears of city officials that grass roots involvement might bring indigenous groups into conflicts with official agencies (Oakland has been the scene of militant protests led by young clergymen and students against community conditions). Accordingly, the poverty programs generally supported existing agency patterns and operations and innovative proposals were not encouraged."

The university, cognizant of these frictions, has sought a more effective *modus operandi*. In a report issued in April 1965, the university concluded that while many successful community development patterns have been shaped by stimulating conflict with local government, the nature of the volatile Oakland situation dictated "that relationships with associations and civic organizations should be limited to providing aid for such projects as would not involve active conflict with an agency of city government."

While the University-Oakland Project worked in comparative anonymity, its efforts had an impact at the grass-roots level. Perhaps the approach with the widest repercussions was what the university described as "relatively old-fashioned public forums" designed to bring some of the more controversial local issues to public attention. A conference on "Race and Property" was con-

ducted while the Berkeley area was in heated debate over a local fair-housing practices law and wider efforts to bar the state from enacting such legislation; the conference produced a book that sold 4,500 copies. Poverty groups were assisted in establishing their own newspaper.

In its more traditional approach to community development work, the University-Oakland Project sought to establish close ties to indigenous groups in the slum areas of Oakland and provide technical and organizing assistance. In the course of this activity, some students involved in the University-Oakland Project community action programs developed serious conflicts with local officials who have questioned the motives of the students as going beyond the project's objectives and into such areas as U.S. foreign policy and stimulation of local protest groups.

Despite the official suspicions of student involvement, several student-oriented programs have proved successful. In one effort, some 350 university students tutor Negro children in the elementary schools. This project has been developed with the cooperation of the School of Education faculty. In another project, third-year law students serve as liaison aides to assist poor residents in the Oakland area in need of local legal aid or defense. This program, under the guidance of the law faculty, was instrumental in establishing a nonprofit corporation ("Corporation of the Poor") to mount a self-help project funded by the Office of Economic Opportunity.

Government-Related Programs

Since 1965, an assistant liaison officer has been serving as the university's extension agent to the new Oakland Economic Development Council on projects for minority-group employment. In this capacity, the university extension project has organized a conference for small businessmen and seminars and conferences on human relations and intergroup relations.

The University-Oakland Project also launched a continuing seminar on local government and urban problems in which twenty-eight San Francisco Bay Area city managers join university specialists to consider major emerging policy problems.

As an outgrowth of the Foundation's extension grant, the university-Oakland Project reports that it helped develop an urban

extension program for the entire Bay Area and that the enlarged program has received a Federal training grant under the Civil Rights Act as well as a number of smaller grants and contracts.

In-Service Educational Programs

The University-Oakland Project has provided many full or partial scholarships to personnel from member agencies of the Oakland gray-area project to university extension courses and conferences. In addition, the university gave programs to facilitate rapid communication of new and pertinent developments in the social sciences to public and private agency personnel. The subjects included "Educating the Culturally Deprived," "Problems of Supervision in New Programs," "Research Designing," and "New Perspectives of Correctional Department Clients."

Urban Extension Outlook

In considering its future role in urban extension, the university believes greater strength should be placed on applied research—specifically, in developing a link between government and campus that is similar to the research and development team in industry. In a report to the Foundation in 1965, it wrote:

> "The university's basic research is not translated into operational form for government agencies, and research needs of the agencies are not posed in researchable form to the community of scholars in the university.... The absence of such a linkage has been noticed by many thoughtful scholars. And while the university has many research-oriented centers and institutes, these tend to support the faculty's interest in basic research. Thus, the type of applied research which extension could provide would not conflict with these organizations but, rather, would complement their work and improve the communication between them and the community and its agencies."

UNIVERSITY OF MISSOURI

Missouri was the first major university in the nation to consolidate all of its extension activities in one department. And, while the basis of extension operations in the state had been primarily rural-oriented, the awareness of great changes moved the university to develop new resources to deal with urban areas.

In July, 1962, the university received a two-year grant of $70,000 for strengthening its urban extension program. The funds were used to employ a home economist to work in a low-income Negro neighborhood of Kansas City, a community development agent to

work with several deteriorating neighborhoods of Kansas City, and a specialist on the Columbia campus to initiate a program for organized labor.

Shortly after the grant was made, the state legislature and the university trustees agreed to establish campuses in St. Louis and Kansas City. C. Brice Ratchford, dean of extension at the university, says the decision was influenced in part by the grant and by preliminary urban extension work by the university that helped stimulate interest in Kansas City in having a branch of the university. The university now has a large staff of teachers, researchers, and extension personnel in the metropolitan area.

Home Economist as Urban Agent

The university employed a Negro home economist, Ella B. Stackhouse, who had years of experience as part of the university's cooperative extension program in Southeast Missouri. She was assigned to the Leeds (Dunbar) neighborhood on the eastern fringe of Kansas City, where some 200 low-income Negro families lived. While the area was declining in appearance, it still had a measure of stability. Most of the families were long time residents of Kansas City and were oriented to city living.

The program sought to determine whether the approaches used successfully by home economists in rural areas could be applied in this urban setting. The project was regarded as successful. Indeed, Dean Ratchford believed Mrs. Stackhouse was even more effective in the city than in her rural assignments. In addition to her progress in teaching home-economics techniques and in individual family education, she helped improve the neighborhood as a whole. Educational programs on nutrition, clothing purchase and repair, and other household affairs were accompanied by neighborhood "clean-up" campaigns and other group efforts. For example, the program led to neighborhood residents joining together to present a case for better garbage pickup and other municipal services.

When the grant funds were exhausted, the county provided funds to continue the work. "With the initiation of the war on poverty," reports Dean Ratchford, "the city and county experienced no difficulty in involving people from this neighborhood in planning programs qualifying for Federal assistance. The same did not apply to other low-income neighborhoods."

Labor Education Program

Recognizing the important role played by organized labor in Missouri, especially in its urban centers, the university established a program to train union officials and members in community relations.

Under the direction of a coordinator, who was placed in the Economics Department of the Columbia campus, the Missouri Labor Education Program was administered jointly by the University Extension Division and the School of Business and Public Administration. Members of the staff received joint academic appointments.

A twelve-member advisory board, made up of trade union officials, recommended and evaluated programs. Activities included a one-day educational institute for railroad trainmen and the garment-workers union in Kansas City, a two-day training conference for the Missouri Association of Letter Carriers in Columbia, a pilot series of six lectures on economic affairs for labor officials, a two-day conference for eighty-five union leaders, and two programs on labor and government in which union and government officials participated.

The program proved successful enough to warrant the addition of two more positions to continue this work after the grant funds were spent.

Community Development

University officials report that the community development effort failed.

As in the home-economics experiment, the objective was to determine the extent to which the successful programs in nonmetropolitan areas could be applied in the cities.

A university community-development agent—a young man who had just completed his graduate work—was to concentrate his efforts in four low-income neighborhoods in Kansas City. His mission was generally to help the communities identify their problems and organize to cope with them more effectively. The university believes that, because of conflicting philosophy within the university on the role of a community-development agent, the agent's inexperience, and a number of other factors, "the value of a community-development agent in an urban setting remains unan-

swered. No one who observed the work felt it was sufficiently meritorious to be continued as it was operated for the past two years." Dean Ratchford found that "the only visible result of the two years work in community development was somewhat greater participation in civic matters in two of the neighborhoods." Yet he would like to try the experiment again with a more experienced agent operating within a more clearly defined framework.

UNIVERSITY OF OKLAHOMA

Despite the dramatic growth of many cities in the Southwest, the region generally is regarded as behind many other sections in its awareness of the social consequences of urbanization. The University of Oklahoma, however, has been actively trying to call attention to emerging urban developments.

The university received a $125,000 Ford Foundation grant in December 1961 for a three-year urban extension program, to which it agreed to contribute $95,000 in cash and services from local sources.

Administered by the College of Continuing Education, the urban extension program sought to develop "urban scientists" who would be able to link the campus to the community. The urban scientist was envisaged as having a two-way responsibility: "First to live in the community and to acquaint himself with its problems, its structure, its leadership, and in turn to acquaint the leadership of the community with the resources that the university would have available in solving some of these problems." He was also to feed back his experiences to the university, through seminars and similar means, thereby leading the faculty and his colleagues to carry out related research and refine curricula.

The urban scientists were looked upon as interns, whose function was to help develop a graduate curriculum as well as to provide services to the community. Seven interns were involved: five were staff members of the university's extension division and two were graduate fellows.

The program began with an intensive eight-week summer session, the last of which the interns spent at Community Studies, Inc., in Kansas City, obtaining insights into municipal and urban problems.

The seven trainees in the program were assigned to Oklahoma City, Tulsa, Duncan, Lawton, Purcell, Poteau, and, briefly, Ponca

City. In each of these localities the local chamber of commerce or an *ad hoc* citizens committee became, in effect, the sponsors for the extension program and pledged funds for office space, secretarial assistance, and, in some instances, contributions to the salary of the trainee.

The trainees carried out operations ranging from work with the local chamber of commerce to assisting in the paper work and technical preparation of an urban renewal plan for Oklahoma City.

In many of the cities there was a genuine desire to encourage the involvement of urban scientists in local affairs. It was the university itself which expressed reservations about the program. Joe E. Brown, director of the program, believed that the most obvious lack and the most seriously needed conceptual tool was "some scientifically respectable unifying generalization, or theory, of urbanization, particularly as this phenomenon relates to the transformation of the human resource and the patterns of values, attitudes, and behavior which emerge in this transformation." Brown was convinced that the problem of the city was not predominantly technical, physical, or financial, but was at bottom a problem of the implications of urbanization for the value systems and the behavior of people.* The university questioned whether the search for an urban theory and a practical application of the scientist to the immediate problem before him had been satisfactorily bridged in the Oklahoma extension program.

Nonetheless there was evidence that business groups and some civic organizations believed that the university represented impartial "know-how" and research potential that was genuinely needed in the neglected field of urban analysis and planning.

Moreover, if the value of the field work is in question, there is unmistakable value to a steady flow of graduates who have some competence in the complicated laws and processes of urban renewal, have learned something about the nature of urban racial problems, and understand the structure and financing of state and local government. "Even a little bit of expertise on urban affairs can go a long way in the younger cities, particularly in urbanizing

---

*His view is elaborated in *Programs in Urban Science: A Terminal Report*, College of Continuing Education, University of Oklahoma, August 1964. Brown is currently chairman of the economics department at the University of Toledo.

agricultural regions," said one official, and graduates of the University of Oklahoma program are finding productive jobs in local government and civic organizations in Oklahoma and adjacent areas.

At the conclusion of the experimental phase of its urban extension program, the University of Oklahoma decided to retain urban extension offices in Oklahoma City, Lawton, and Tulsa in order to build on the groundwork laid by the pilot projects. The Tulsa office, with an expanded staff under the direction of its first urban scientist, C. J. Roberts, has developed into a permanent off-campus university installation offering a variety of educational services to the area. The Lawton-Altus Office of School and Community Services continues to operate. The urban scientist in Oklahoma City left to direct the Oklahoma State Office of Economic Opportunity and has been replaced by a staff member operating from the nearby Norman campus.

PURDUE UNIVERSITY

The focus of Purdue University's Urban Extension Program was an urban renewal area in East Chicago—a bleak "no-man's land" between two major urban centers Chicago and Gary. The area was the victim of industrial sprawl at its worst, with the added problem of being divided among many small jurisdictions.

The university's Calumet Center at Hammond, Indiana, had immersed itself in the problems of this area over the years with the formation of the Purdue-Calumet Development Foundation—a nonprofit agency co-sponsored by the university and business and civic interests to help improve the physical environment. The agency had sponsored the East Chicago urban renewal project. To direct parallel efforts "toward improvement of the human dimension," the university developed an Urban Development Institute.

The Ford Foundation made a $100,000 three-year grant in 1961 (with a further $81,500 in 1966) to underwrite a single aspect of the institute's total program—a so-called family service program.

The institute's family service efforts concentrated on establishing communication with the existing health, education, and welfare leadership, both professional and volunteer. Initially the program was limited to he urban renewal area; later it was extended to agencies covering Lake County. The purpose was "to mobilize

and energize middle-range leadership and professional resources to work on the problems of low-income families."

To carry out the assignment the institute assigned a skilled family service coordinator, Mary Holtman. She sought to answer a variety of needs through the following methods:

—Stimulation of local activity through such activities as the establishment of a cooperative play program in the housing project and participation on various local committees and agency boards.

—Provision of consultants from the university and outside experts to work with groups on special problems. As an example, the School of Social Service, with the aid of graduate students, conducted a survey of day-care needs in Lake County.

—Sponsorship of community-wide conferences for middle-range leadership. "Family in the Community" conferences helped stimulate new in-service training activities and improve liaison between professional and lay leaders.

—Uncovering and mobilizing unused professional resources within the community, such as nurses, home economists, ministers, and social workers, and providing brief training or retraining where necessary. Workshops for credit were held on the Calumet campus to help continue the education of skilled residents.

With the arrival of the antipoverty program, the family service engaged full-time housewives who had been trained nurses, home economists, social workers, or teachers to train welfare recipients to work side by side with professionals to serve families under health, education, and welfare programs.

The Urban Development Institute, with the help of Office of Economic Opportunity funds, is now working with several projects on a county-wide basis as well as with some emerging privately-financed projects. There is a good prospect that large industrial corporations in the area will support the institute's social development activities.

UNIVERSITY OF ILLINOIS

The University of Illinois' three-year, $125,000 Foundation-financed program had three objectives:

—to define the university's role in meeting urban problems;

—to train "urban generalists" capable of analyzing and resolving community problems;

—to provide direct university assistance in selected communities in the state.

The university created the Office of Community Development to administer the grant. The O.C.D. was not attached to any college of the university; rather it was established as a unit within the office of the Executive Vice President and Provost.

The impact of the program was blunted by difficulties in reconciling the role of the urban extension project within the structure of the university. There appeared to be great resistance on the part of established departments to the new office.

The "urban generalist" was envisaged as an individual who had already received his doctorate in an established discipline, "who could see as many of the problems as possible, educate other specialists to the broad general aspect of urban problems, and call upon specialists who could solve particular problems."

Three young professors—Nason E. Hall, a sociologist; Herbert V. Gamberg, a sociologist; and Everett G. Smith, a geographer—became the university's urban generalists. They were assigned to three middle-sized urban centers, Peoria, Rockford, and Springfield, where they carried out research on various urban problems, including a comparative analysis of downtown change and studies of the power structure and decision-making groups in selected communities.

While some of these studies provided the base for fruitful actions in these communities, (the downtown studies led to a series of seminars for mayors and city managers; two Federally aided transportation demonstrations emerged in Peoria and Decatur; and Peoria annexed 27,000 more people on the basis of the power-structure study) the university personnel did not participate directly in programs at the neighborhood level.

The university's self-study of its obligations to serve the urban community pointed away from the direct involvement of university personnel in the front lines of community action. It took the view that the university could best serve an urban society by concentrating on its regular teaching and research functions.

James Coke, former director of the office and now at Kent State University in Ohio, believed that despite the structural difficulties at the University of Illinois, the office yielded results in the form of publishable research studies and follow-up actions.

"In 'urban extension' terms," Coke wrote, "the latter set of payoffs did not become operative during the period of the grant, except for informal consultation and advice. However, the Office of Community Development continued to be supported by university funds from 1963 to 1965, during which time mass-transportation demonstration grants were obtained and a series of seminars on downtown change was conducted for community leaders and public officials."

ACTION-HOUSING, PITTSBURGH

The most successful of the Foundation-assisted action programs in direct neighborhood services has been conducted not by a university but by a nonacademic community organization, ACTION (Allegheny Council to Improve Our Neighborhoods)-Housing. This Pittsburgh area effort sought to carry out a demonstration of urban extension by using a county-wide nonprofit civic organization with extensive experience in housing and urban development.

ACTION-Housing, which was created in 1957 by the same broad business and civic leadership responsible for the famed physical renaissance of downtown Pittsburgh, was well under way when it received its first major Foundation grant in 1962 (the total now is $513,000). The grant was intended in part to help ACTION-Housing expand into social problems its successful extension work in neighborhood physical improvement and housing. It was also designed to engage the participation of Pittsburgh's major universities.

Headed by Bernard E. Loshbough, a nationally known specialist in housing and community development, ACTION-Housing has been successful in stimulating physical and social improvements in three large declining neighborhoods of Pittsburgh. The technique has been to seek out or organize a neighborhood citizens group and give it professional guidance by an extension worker (in whose selection the group participates) to develop a comprehensive program for social and physical improvements.

The universities, while involved in several projects (see page 37), were less successful in relating their resources to specific needs in depressed neighborhoods.

Community Development

The three areas in which ACTION-Housing works vary ethnically

but resemble each other in being neighborhoods in transition that lacked effective community effort to halt decline.

The Homewood-Brushton area is a predominantly Negro neighborhood that underwent radical change within a decade. It is an area not only in physical decline, but also frayed by racial tensions.

Hazelwood-Glenwood is predominantly a white, lower middle-class area dependent to a great extent upon a large steel mill which dominates the general area. Many of the residents had been hard hit by automation and subsequent cutbacks in steel employment.

Perry-Hilltop, a middle-class neighborhood showing signs of deterioration, felt a decline of public services, particularly in the schools, and insecurity because of a new racially integrated low-income housing project.

In each area a written memorandum of agreement was signed between ACTION-Housing and the citizen's group as equal partners, specifying the responsibilities of each.

Ford Foundation funds have been matched by contributions from local corporations, public and private agencies, other foundations, and the neighborhood residents themselves. More recently, Office of Economic Opportunity funds have been granted to augment programs in two of the three areas, and to extend their pattern of neighborhood involvement to two other neighborhoods, Lawrenceville and South Oakland.

James V. Cunningham, director of neighborhood urban extension for ACTION-Housing, says the agency's goal is to stay only until it has helped develop a self-generating organization which has a staff and a core of responsible leaders capable of raising funds on its own and maintaining firm links to the structure of the city. "ACTION-Housing won't be totally out of the picture," he says. "We would be available as a specialized resource and consultant to the neighborhood group. But the big breakthrough will come when their staff is no longer our staff."

ACTION-Housing's extension agents—a former insurance man, a young veteran of the Peace Corps, and a public housing official—have sufficient flexibility and aptitudes to be classified as "urban generalists."

The community-based efforts assisted by ACTION-Housing's extension agents range from short- and long-range physical improvements to programs of social and economic change. One

neighborhood's residents hired their own city planner and, in three years work, developed a $3.3 million urban renewal conservation program that is now being carried out. A code-enforcement campaign was successful in eliminating thousands of housing violations. Sections were upgraded through zoning improvements. Pressure on city authorities led to improved street cleaning and lighting, and removal of abandoned cars. New public schools, community centers, and youth centers were obtained. Merchants were organized in a self-help program that resulted in more off-street parking, better police protection, and other improvements.

An intergroup relations program was developed in which racial hostilities have been aired and channeled into constructive efforts. A home day-care center for children of working mothers and a neighborhood center for treating drug addicts have been established. Employment centers have been established and the programs have registered the unemployed, assisted them in training, and placed many workers in jobs for which they previously were unqualified.

On a less tangible level, the morale of residents in the transitional neighborhoods has risen, and they have acquired a sense of community identification and of power to stem deterioration.

The concept of a voice in policy decisions by neighborhood residents—even against the judgment of professionals—has been adhered to. The urban renewal plan, for example, reflected residents' wishes to retain three-story tenements marked for destruction. While the planner advocated clearance of the buildings, the residents regarded them as satisfactory housing and felt that their low rent more than compensated for the lack of elegance.

City-Wide Projects

In addition to the intensive work in the three demonstration areas, ACTION-Housing has instituted several across-the-board projects. One example is summer tutoring programs for elementary-school pupils who are behind in their reading achievement. Using volunteers and students from Carnegie Institute of Technology, the University of Pittsburgh, Mount Mercy College, and other schools the program is directed by Beatrice F. Goldszer, an educational specialist who is a consultant to ACTION-Housing. The program involved not only the design of a new tutoring technique, but a program for teaching the tutors themselves.

Instituted originally on a seven-week summer basis, the tutorial program has become a year-round effort using the facilities of local public and parochial schools. Mrs. Goldszer's tutoring technique for disadvantaged children seeks to make learning a "fun process." Games, body movements, and even baseball schedules are used to teach the youngsters concepts, language skills, and arithmetic.

ACTION-Housing also was active in establishing Head Start programs in several neighborhoods. Head Start aims at helping four- and five-year olds from disadvantaged families to get a better start toward a good education. This program is financed through the Mayor's Committee on Human Resources, which receives Federal grants.

ACTION-Housing's performance led to its being selected by the Office of Economic Opportunity to conduct a training program for Pittsburgh's poverty-program workers and volunteers.

University Resources

The University of Pittsburgh's Graduate School of Public and International Affairs prepared a major research report on the city services provided in one of the ACTION-Housing neighborhoods, which is being evaluated for its applicability to other areas of the city. The university has also trained and provided interns from its Graduate School of Social Work to assist the extension workers in the neighborhoods. Occasionally faculty specialists have been called upon to assist in projects.

The Carnegie Institute of Technology's facilities were used for the remedial reading programs for school children, and the home economics department of Margaret Morrison Carnegie College assisted in extension courses in the Homewood-Brushton and Hazelwood areas.

Duquesne University assisted in employment guidance in the Hazelwood employment program. A retail management course it developed for Homewood-Brushton merchants apparently met with little success.

An academic council was set up to extend the resources of the local universities to neighborhoods. But while the Pittsburgh project has become something of a yardstick for efforts at community organization, it has still to work out a design for university involvement which matches the expectations of the urban extension concept.

Project Directors

ACTION-Housing, Inc.
Number Two Gateway Center, Pittsburgh, Pennsylvania 15222
Bernard Loshbough, Executive Director

University of California (Berkeley)
Berkeley, California 94720
John Denton

University of Delaware
Newark, Delaware 19711
Edward S. Overman, Director, Division of Urban Affairs

University of Illinois
Project completed
James Coke, now at Kent State University

University of Missouri
Columbia, Missouri 65202
C. Brice Ratchford, Vice President for Extension

University of Oklahoma
Norman, Oklahoma 73069
C. J. Roberts, Director, Tulsa Extension Office, or
Dean Thurmon White

Purdue University
Lafayette, Indiana 47907
Thomas Sherrard, Research Director, or
Carl Elliott

Rutgers, The State University
New Brunswick, New Jersey 08903
David Popenoe, Research Director, Urban Studies Center, or
John E. Bebout

University of Wisconsin
Madison, Wisconsin 53706
L. H. Adolfson, Chancellor

Selected Bibliography

The following literature on urban problems and university extension and research is not available from the Ford Foundation. Material listed under "Project Literature" is available from the respective universities and institutions, as listed on page 39, unless otherwise noted.

GENERAL LITERATURE

Books

Abrams, Charles. *The City is the Frontier,* New York, Harper & Row, 1965.

Bollens, John C. and Henry J. Schmandt. *The Metropolis: Its People, Politics, and Economic Life,* New York, Harper & Row, 1965.

Chamber Of Commerce Of The U.S. Task Force On Economic Growth And Opportunity. *The Concept of Poverty,* New York, 1966.

Cloward, Richard A. and Lloyd E. Ohlin. *Delinquency and Opportunity; A Theory of Delinquent Gangs,* New York, Macmillan Co., 1960.

Conant, James Bryant. *Slums and Suburbs,* New York, McGraw-Hill, 1961.

Cox, Harvey. *The Secular City,* New York, Macmillan Co., 1965.

Denton, J. H. *Apartheid—American Style,* New York, National Committee Against Discrimination in Housing (In preparation).

——, ed. *Race and Property,* Berkeley, Calif., Diablo Press, 1964.

Duhl, Leonard J. *The Urban Condition: People and Policy in the Metropolis,* New York, Basic Books, 1963.

Elias, C. E., Jr., ed, and others. *Metropolis: Values in Conflict,* Belmont, Calif., Wadsworth Publishing, 1964.

Frieden, Bernard J. *The Future of Old Neighborhoods; Rebuilding For a Changing Population,* Cambridge, Mass., Massachusetts Institute of Technology Press, 1964.

Glazer, Nathan and Daniel P. Moynihan. *Beyond the Melting Pot; The Negroes, Puerto Ricans, Jews, Italians, and Irish of New York City,* Cambridge, Mass., Massachusetts Institute of Technology Press, 1963.

Gordon, Margaret S., ed. *Poverty in America,* San Francisco, Chandler Publishing Co., 1965.

Greer, Scott. *The Emerging City: Myth and Reality,* New York, Macmillan Co., 1962.

Harrington, Michael. *The Other America,* New York, Macmillan Co., 1962.

Hauser, Philip M. and Leo F. Schnore, eds. *The Study of Urbanization,* New York, John Wiley & Sons, Inc., 1965.

Henderson, Dorothy M. *People Have Power*, Montreal, Harvest House, 1964.

Hunter, David R. *The Slums; Challenge and Response*, New York, Macmillan Co., 1964.

Klotsche, J. M. *The Urban University and the Future of Our Cities*, New York, Harper, 1966.

Martin, Roscoe C., F. Munger and others. *Decisions In Syracuse*, Garden City, N. Y., Anchor Books, Doubleday and Co., Inc., 1965.

McKelvey, Blake. *The Urbanization of America—1860-1915*, New Brunswick, New Jersey, Rutgers University Press, 1963.

Mumford, Lewis. *The City in History*, New York, Harcourt, Brace & World, Inc., 1961.

Sabine, George H. *A History of Political Theory*, New York, Holt, Rinehart & Winston, Inc., 3rd ed., 1961.

Slivek, Louis. *Man In Metropolis*, New York, Doubleday and Co., Inc., 1966.

Thompson, Wilbur. *A Preface to Urban Economics*, Baltimore, Johns Hopkins Press, 1963.

Vernon, Raymond. *Metropolis 1985*, Garden City, N. Y., Anchor Books, Doubleday and Co., Inc., 1963.

Periodicals

"Urban Studies" (Special Issue), *American Behavioral Scientist*, Vol. VI, No. 6, February, 1963.

Flatlands, a bi-weekly newspaper written and published by and for the Oakland poor. Commenced publication March, 1966.

Trans-action. A bi-monthly journal "to further the understanding and use of the social sciences," a publication of the Community Leadership Project of Washington University, St. Louis, Missouri.

Urban Affairs Quarterly. Sponsored by the City University of New York. Sage Publications, 150 Fifth Avenue, New York.

Conference Proceedings

Denton, J. H. *Community Development in Developed Communities*. A critique of community development as practiced in American cities. Paper read at Western Regional Science Association meetings in 1965 (In preparation).

Miller, Raymond L. *Extension—Escalator of Education*. Paper delivered before the San Joaquin Farm Bureau honoring the 50th Anniversary of the Agricultural Extension Service. Stockton, Calif., September 10, 1964.

University and Community. Proceedings of a conference, April 25-26, 1963 under the auspices of The Association of Urban Universities and The Johnson Foundation.

Urban Extension. Proceedings of the Pittsburgh Urban Extension Conference, ACTION-Housing, Inc., Pittsburgh, Pennsylvania, 1961.

PROJECT LITERATURE

ACTION-Housing, Inc. *Annual Report to the Board of Directors,* Pittsburgh, 1966.

——*It's Your Neighborhood,* Pittsburgh, 1966.

——*Neighborhood Urban Extension* (3 vols., 1963, 1964, 1965), Pittsburgh.

——*Plan of Operations—Neighborhood Urban Extension,* Pittsburgh, 1963.

——*Rural-Urban Ties in the New Society.* Paper delivered by Bernard Loshbough before the Agricultural Extension Association of Westmoreland County, Greensburg, Pennsylvania, October, 1961.

——*The Urban Renewal Impact Study: Issues, Findings, and Recommendations* (2 vols.), Pittsburgh, 1963.

Bebout, John E. *The Idea of the Urban Extension Service,* New Brunswick, New Jersey, Urban Studies Center, Rutgers, The State University, 1963.

——and Ronald Grele. *Where Cities Meet: The Urbanization of New Jersey,* Princeton, D. Van Nostrand, 1964.

Boyle, Patrick M. *Columbia County Survey: A Report to Respondents;* Report No. 2; Wisconsin Survey Research Laboratory, University Extension Division, Madison, January, 1963.

Brown, Joe E. *Programs in Urban Science; A Terminal Report,* College of Continuing Education, Norman, University of Oklahoma, 1964.

Coke, James G. "The Lesser Metropolitan Areas of Illinois," *Illinois Government, No. 15* (November, 1962), pp. 1-5.

Doerflinger, Jon A. *Kenosha County, Wisconsin Study: An Overview of the Social Effects of Population Change;* Report No. 1, Department of Rural Sociology, College of Agriculture, Madison, January, 1963.

Dye, Thomas R. and Charlotte Shipley. *Inventory of Governments in the Fox Valley;* Bureau of Government, University of Wisconsin Extension Division, Madison, November, 1963.

Eroen, Norma L., Wayne H. Weidemann and D. G. Marshall. *Kenosha County, Wisconsin Study: Role and Function of Selected Public Institutions in a Changing Society;* Report No. 3, Department of Rural Sociology, College of Agriculture, Madison, January, 1963.

Glaab, Charles N. *The American City,* Homewood, Ill., The Dorsey Press, Inc., 1963.

Jackson County University of Missouri Center. *Expanded Educational Opportunities Through the University Extension Center of Jackson County,* Independence, August, 1965.

——*Your Jackson County University of Missouri Extension Center,* Independence, December, 1962.

Peterson, Leroy J., Richard A. Rossmiller, and others, *Economic Impact of State Support Models on Educational Finance;* Cooperative Re-

search Project No. 1495, School of Education, University of Wisconsin, Madison, October, 1963.

Schmandt, Henry J. *The Municipal Incorporation Trend, 1950-1960;* Report No. NS 11, Research and Advisory Service, Bureau of Government, University of Wisconsin Extension Division, Madison, November, 1961.

Smith, Everett G., Jr. *Downtown Change in Three Middle-Sized Cities,* Office of Community Development and the Department of Geography, Chicago, University of Illinois, 1963.

Tien, H. Yuan. *Milwaukee-Metropolitan Area Fact Book, 1940, 1950,* and *1960,* Madison, The University of Wisconsin Press, 1962.

University of Delaware, Division of Urban Affairs. *Brief Description of Extension and Service Work,* Newark, Delaware, 1966.

Publications

The following is a selected list of publications available without charge from the Ford Foundation, Office of Reports, 477 Madison Avenue, New York, N.Y. 10022. A complete list of publications is also available.

The Ford Foundation Annual Report.

About the Ford Foundation: *General program activities.*

American Community Development: *Preliminary reports on comprehensive community projects assisted by the Foundation in Boston, New Haven, Oakland, Philadelphia, and the state of North Carolina.*

Context the World: *The International Training and Research program.*

Cross Section: *Foundation programs illustrated by activities in a single city (Pittsburgh).*

Ford Foundation Grants in Vocational Education: *A first report on projects in this field.*

Golden Years?: *Experiments and research in problems of the aging.*

Housing and Urban Development: The Private Foundation's Role: *from an address by Louis Winnick, Associate Director of the Foundation's Public Affairs program, at the Sixteenth Annual Conference of the Council on Foundations in Pittsburgh, May, 1965.*

Metropolis: *Early grants on urban and regional problems.*

Skills, Scholarship and the Public Service: *Programs to improve knowledge and practice of government.*

Society of the Streets: *Activities in youth development.*

THE LIBRARY OF
APR 11 1967
CONTINUING EDUCATION

Ford Foundation..."to advance human welfare"

Trustees

Julius A. Stratton, *Chairman*

Donald K. David, *Vice Chairman*

Stephen D. Bechtel, Chairman of the Board, Bechtel Corporation

Eugene R. Black

McGeorge Bundy, President, Ford Foundation

John Cowles, President, Minneapolis Star and Tribune Company

Mark F. Ethridge, Lecturer, University of North Carolina

Benson Ford, Vice President, Ford Motor Company

Henry Ford II, Chairman of the Board, Ford Motor Company

Laurence M. Gould, President Emeritus, Carleton College

Roy E. Larsen, Chairman, Executive Committee, Time Inc.

John H. Loudon, Chairman of the Board,
Royal Dutch Petroleum Company

J. Irwin Miller, Chairman of the Board, Cummins Engine Company

Bethuel M. Webster, Partner,
Webster Sheffield Fleischmann Hitchcock & Chrystie

Charles E. Wyzanski, Jr., Judge, United States District Court

Executive Officers

McGeorge Bundy, *President*

David E. Bell, *Vice President*

W. McNeil Lowry, *Vice President*

Verne S. Atwater, *Vice President*

Champion Ward, *Deputy Vice President*

Joseph M. McDaniel, Jr., *Secretary*

Thomas H. Lenagh, *Treasurer*

Ford Foundation 477 Madison Avenue New York, N. Y. 10022